



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,378	03/24/2004	Noriyuki Tamura	SNY-053	3329
20374	7590	04/14/2008	EXAMINER	
KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK			HODGE, ROBERT W	
SUITE 1105				
1215 SOUTH CLARK STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22202			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/807,378	TAMURA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ROBERT HODGE	1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/19/04</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-15 in the reply filed on 5/9/07 is acknowledged. Claim 16 is also included in the election of claims 1-15 because of its dependency on claim 2. The omission of claim 16 in the restriction requirement was an inadvertent typo.

***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/19/04 has been considered by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/31720 (U.S. Patent No. 7,195,842 is used as the English equivalent document) hereinafter Fujimoto in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0144160 hereinafter Odaohhara.

Fujimoto teaches a lithium secondary battery that has a negative electrode having an active material layer of amorphous silicon deposited on a copper current collector through a deposition process and the amorphous silicon is a thin layer and a binder is included in the active material layer (column 3, lines 13-67 and Experiments 1 and 2).

Fujimoto does not teach a method of charging and discharging the lithium secondary battery within a range of state of charge.

Odaohhara teaches a method of charging and discharging lithium ion batteries such that the battery is only partially discharged before it is subsequently charged. Odaohhara recognizes that by only partially discharging the battery and then subsequently charging the battery versus fully discharging the battery and subsequently charging, the battery that was partially discharged will retain a higher discharge capacity

longer over the cycle life versus the battery that was fully discharged. Odaohhara further recognizes that the best conditions for a partial discharge are a 30% discharge and a 50% discharge (figure 9 and paragraphs [0020]-[0022]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to partially discharge the battery of Fujimoto before subsequently charging it as taught by Odaohhara in order to maintain a higher discharge capacity of the battery over the cycle life of the battery thus increasing its useful life.

The Examiner notes that the best understanding of the recitation of "range of state of charge" from the claim and instant specification is that the battery is partially discharged before charging. With regards to the recitations in claims 1 and 3-12 reciting that no peak related to a silicon lithium compound from X-ray diffraction is observed or no peak between a range of 18-28° is observed (which relates to the area that a silicon lithium compound would be observed), it is the Examiner's position that because Odaohhara is partially discharging the battery and not fully discharging the battery, a silicon lithium compound will not be formed and by the combination of Fujimoto and Odaohhara the battery of Fujimoto operated by Odaohhara's method will also not form a silicon lithium compound. Therefore the burden is shifted to applicants to prove that the battery of Fujimoto as operated by Odaohhara's method does not meet the limitations of the instant claims by a showing of evidence and not arguments.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT HODGE whose telephone number is (571)272-2097. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Hodge/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795